

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 1/14/10.

Claims 1, 3-7, 13, 15, 16, 19, 20, and 55-71 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-7, 16, 19, 20, 55-58, and 61-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aravamudan US Patent 6,301,609 in view of Stimmel US Patent 6,678,719.

As per claim 1, Aravamudan teaches a notification system, comprising:

a monitor that monitors a state of a device, the monitor derives a context of a user from the state of the device and based at least in part on the context the monitor infers a likely available state of the user; (see Aravamudan, col. 7, lines 40-70) and

a bounding system that classifies a notification to the user with a predefined notification priority, (see Aravamudan, col. 2, lines 25-50) the bounding system defers the notification based at least in part on the notification priority and the likely available state of the user,(see Aravamudan, col. 10, lines 15-51)

the bounding system establishes a group of notifications associated with at least first and second priorities with a highest priority affiliated with the group of notifications, (see Aravamudan, col. 7, lines 40-70) wherein content of at least the highest priority

Art Unit: 2174

notification included in the group of notifications is presented, on a display area, to the user in its entirety, (see Aravamudan, col. 10, lines 15-51) and content of notifications associated with lesser priorities included in the group of notifications are displayed. (see Aravamudan, col. 10, lines 45-52)

However, Aravamudan does explicitly teach forwards the group of notifications to the user based on an occurrence of a notification on the same display area for the user as a summary.

Stimmel teaches forward entire group of user on the same display are the user as summary. (see Stimmel, fig. 3A-3D)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Stimmel's teaching with method of Aravamudan in order to provide user's priority group with user summary.

As per claim 3, Aravamudan and Stimmel teach the system of claim 1. Aravamudan further teaches wherein the predefined priority is assigned based upon the happening of a condition (col. 7, line 49 col. 8, line 31).

As per claim 4, Aravamudan and Stimmel teach the system of claim 3. Aravamudan further teaches further comprising a subscription user interface to enable users to configure attributes of a notification, wherein the bounding system that classifies a notification with a predefined priority, classifies the notification with predefined priority based on at least in part on the attributes of the notification (col. 6, lines 45-63 and col. 9, line 64-col. 10, line 51; it is inherent that a user interface is presented to the user because the user is allowed to configure attributes of a notification).

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 5, Aravamudan and Stimmel teach the system of claim 4.

Aravamudan further teaches wherein the attributes are defined in .a notification schema (see col. 6, lines 12-31).

As per claim 6, Aravamudan and Stimmel teach the system of claim 5.

Aravamudan further teaches the notification schema further comprising at least one of a notification class, a source, a source assigned priority, a sender, a target, one or more content components, a relevant context, or advanced attributes (See col. 6, lines 12-31).

As per claim 7, Aravamudan and Stimmel teach the system of claim 5.

Aravamudan further teaches further comprising a preferences profile for assigning priority based upon settings in the notification schema (see col. 6, lines 12-31).

As per claim 16, Aravamudan and Stimmel teach the system of claim 1.

Aravamudan further teaches further comprising a notification agent that directs notifications from one or more sources to one or more notification sinks based at least in part on the predefined protocol and the likely available states (see col. 5, line 52-col. 6, line 31).

As per claim 19, Aravamudan and Stimmel teach the system of claim 1.

Aravamudan further teaches further comprising a max deferral setting that is associated with a notification priority to enable at least one of a delivery of the notification at a time-out of the max deferral, and deferral of the notification to the likely available free state (see col. 7, line\$ 49-col. 8, line 31).

As per claim 20, Aravamudan and Stimmel teach the system of claim 19.

Aravamudan further teaches further comprising a setting to enable designated

Art Unit: 2174

notifications to at least one of be passed-through, and restricted during designated periods (see col. 5, line 52-col. 6, line 31).

As per claim 55, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1. Supra.

As per claim 56, Aravamudan and Stimmel teach the method of claim 55.

Aravamudan further teaches wherein classifying the first notification includes classifying the first notification based at least in part on a source of the first notification, a source assigned priority of the first notification, one or more content component of the first notification, of a relevant content of the first priority. (see Aravamudan, col. 2, lines 25-50)

As per claim 57, which is depended on the method of claim 56, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 4, Supra.

As per claim 58, Aravamudan and Stimmel teach the system of claim 55.

Aravamudan further teaches wherein monitoring a state of a device includes monitoring at least one of a calendar, or a time of day, a device activity, or a user location. (see Aravamudan col. 7, line 49-col. 8, line 31).

As per claim 61, Aravamudan and Stimmel teach the method of claim 55.

Aravamudan further teaches the method comprising displaying to the user a list of possible states of the device that could be monitored, the list including a length of pauses in typing, actions in an application, and a length of pauses after actions in an application. (see Aravamudan, col. 7, lines 55-70; Monitoring activity on a keyboard is the same as monitoring pauses in typing)

As per claim 62, Aravamudan and Stimmel teach the method of claim 61.

Aravamudan further teaches comprising receiving from the user a context associated with selected possible states of the device that could be monitored. (see Aravamudan, col. 7, lines 55-70; Monitoring activity on a keyboard is the same as monitoring pauses in typing)

As per claim 63, Aravamudan and Stimmel teach the method of claim 1. Stimmel teaches wherein the group of notification forward to the user contains either the entirety of the content or summary content for each notification awaiting delivery to the user classified by the bounding system. (see Stimmel, col. 3, lines 50-col. 4, lines 15; It is inherent that an email will be display either in summary or entirety.)

As per claim 64, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim 63. Supra.

As per claim 65, Aravamudan teaches a notification system, comprising:

a monitor that:

monitors a state of a device, (see Aravamudan, col. 7, lines 40-70) and

derives a context of a user of the device from the state of the device; (see

Aravamudan, col. 7, lines 40-70) and

a system that:

assigns a notification priority to a notification to the user, defers the notification based at least in part on the notification priority and the context, groups a plurality of notifications to the user into a group, wherein at least one first notification in the group is assigned a first priority and at least one second notification in the group is assigned a second priority, and wherein the first priority is higher than the second priority, (see Aravamudan, col. 7, lines 40-70)

Art Unit: 2174

identifies a display time based on an expiration of a deferral time of the at least one first notification and the context,(see Aravamudan, col. 10, lines 15-51) and

displays, on a display at the identified display time, the plurality of notifications, wherein content of the at least one first notification assigned the first priority is displayed in its entirety and content of the at least one second notification assigned the second priority, and the at least one first notification and the at least one second notification are positioned on the display to indicate that they are in the group. (see Aravamudan, col. 9, lines 60-col. 10, lines 70)

However, Aravamudan fails to explicitly teach a display of a summary. (see Stimmel, fig. 3A-3D)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Stimmel's teaching with method of Aravamudan in order to provide user's priority group with user summary.

As per claim 66, Aravamudan and Stimmel teach the notification system of claim 65. However, Aravamudan does not explicitly teach wherein the at least one second notification is displayed on the display below the at least one first notification. However, It is an obvious design choice to display second notification below the first notification. (see Stimmel, fig. 3A-3D)

As per claim 69, Aravamudan and Stimmel teach the notification system of claim 65, wherein a degree of summarization of the content of the at least one second notification displayed as the summary corresponds to a value of the second priority. (see

Art Unit: 2174

Aravamudan, col. 9, lines 60-col. 10, lines 70)

As per claim 70, Aravamudan and Stimmel teach the notification system of claim 69, wherein the degree of summarization increases higher when the value of the second priority decreases. (see Aravamudan, col. 9, lines 60-col. 10, lines 70)

Claims 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aravamudan US Patent 6,301,609 in view of Stimmel US Patent 6,678,719 further in view of Godefroid US Patent 6,697,840.

As per claim 13, Aravamudan and Stimmel teach the system of claim 1. However, they fail to teach wherein the monitor derives context from at least one of a calendar, or a time of day.

Godefroid 6,697,840 teaches wherein the monitor derives context from at least one of a calendar, or a time of day. (see Godefroid, col. 3, line 5-20)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Godefroid's teaching with method of Aravamudan and Stimmel in order for users to coordinate their schedules.

As per claim 15, Aravamudan and Stimmel teach the system of claim 1. Aravamudan fails to teach wherein the context includes at least one of an office setting, an environment setting, an activity setting, or a driving setting.

Godefroid teaches wherein the context includes at least one of an office setting, an environment setting, an activity setting, or a driving setting. (see Godefroid, col. 5, lines 1-30)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Godefroid's teaching with method of Aravamudan and Stimmel in order for users to coordinate their schedules.

Claims 59, 60, and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aravamudan US Patent 6,301,609 in view of Stimmel US Patent 6,678,719 further in view Massie US Patent 7,162,238.

As per claim 59, Aravamudan and Stimmel teach the method of claim 55. They fail to teach wherein determining that the second notification should be forwarded to the user includes determining an age of the second notification as exceeding a second max deferral setting that is associated with the second classification.

Massie teaches wherein a event is determined based on the age of the second notification as exceeding a second max deferral setting that is associated with the second classification. (see Massie, col. 25, lines 1-26)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Massie's 7,162,238 teaching with method of Aravamudan and Stimmel in order for users to coordinate their schedules.

As per claim 60, Aravamudan, Stimmel, and Massie teach the method of claim 59. They further teaches wherein presenting a content of the first notification as a summary is based at least in part on the first classification and a determination that an age of the first notification does not exceed a first max deferral setting that is associated with the first classification, the first max deferral setting being longer than the second max deferral setting. (see Massie, col. 25, lines 1-26)

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 67, it is rejected under the same rationale as claim as claim 59.

Supra.

Claims 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aravamudan US Patent 6,301,609 in view of Stimmel US Patent 6,678,719 further in view Alperovich US Patent 7,162,238.

As per claim 68, Aravamudan and Stimmel teach the notification system of claim 65. however, they fail to teach wherein the at least one second notification comprises a plurality of notifications each associated with a priority lower than the first priority, and wherein the plurality of notifications from the at least one second notification are displayed on the display in order of their priorities.

Alperovich teaches sort the message display based on priority. (see Alperovich, col. 4, lines 5-30)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Alperovich's teaching with method of Aravamudan and Stimmel in order for users to work more efficiently.

Claims 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aravamudan US Patent 6,301,609 in view of Stimmel US Patent 6,678,719 further in view Dinkelacker US Patent 6,092,068.

Aravamudan and Stimmel teach the notification system of claim 65. However, they fail to teach wherein the least one second notification is associated with at least one gesture, and wherein, upon receiving a user input with respect to the at least one gesture, the system displays additional information on the at least one second notification.

Art Unit: 2174

Dinkelacker teaches wherein the least one second notification is associated with at least one gesture, and wherein, upon receiving a user input with respect to the at least one gesture, the system displays additional information on the at least one second notification. (see Dinkelacker, col. 2, lines 10-35)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Dinkelacker's teaching with method of Aravamudan and Stimmel in order for users to additional information with out overwhelmed the display screen.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 7/28/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's argument focused on the following:

Whether Aravamudan teaches classifying notification based on a priority, deferring notification based on the priority, grouping notification of different priorities into a group, forwarding the group to a user and display?

Aravamudan teaches this limitation because it classifies the users into three different priority groups, (see Aravamudan, col. 7, lines 40-70) and each group receives different type notification. In fact the highest priority group receives immediate notification while lower priority group receives delayed notification. (see Aravamudan, col. 10, lines 45-52)

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 2174

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SIMON KE whose telephone number is (571)272-4062. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and Alternate Fridays 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen S. Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2174

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Peng Ke
/Peng Ke/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2174